PRINTED ON
RECYCLED PAPER
1237654v1

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL LLP MARTIN H. ORLICK (Bar No. 083908), MOrlick@jmbm.com Two Embarcadero Center, Fifth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3813 Telephone: (415) 398-8080 Facsimile: (415) 398-5584 JEFFER MANGELS BUTLER & MITCHELL LLP EUDEEN Y. CHANG (Bar No. 211721), EChang@jmbm.com 3 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, California 92614 Telephone: (949) 623-7200 Facsimile: (949) 623-7202					
9	Attorneys for Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.					
10						
11						
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
13	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - WESTERN DIVISION					
14						
15	RICARDO MURILLO,	CASE NO. 2:11- cv-05695 R (SHx)				
16	Plaintiff,	ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT				
17	v.	JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.'S MOTION TO DISMISS				
18	JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, a New York Corporation; E JACK DALTON, Trustee	110110111011111111111111111111111111111				
19	Dalton Family Trust; MURIEL DALTON, Trustee Dalton Family Trust; E. CLARKE					
20	MOSELEY; STEPHÅNIE MOSELEY; and DOES 1 - 10,					
21	Defendants.					
22						
23	Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.'s ("Bank") Motion to Dismiss ("Motion")					
24	Plaintiff Ricardo Murillo's First Amended Complaint ("Plaintiff") came regularly for hearing on					
25	September 12, 2011, of the above-entitled court before the Honorable Manuel L. Real.					
26	Appearances were noted for the record. The Court, having considered the Motion, the opposition					
27	filed by Plaintiff, and the Reply filed by Bank, and the arguments of counsel, and good cause					
28						

ORDER RE: MOTION TO DISMISS Case No. LA CV11-5695 R (SHx)

1 2

T237654vI

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

appearing	therefore	rules	as	follows.

The Court grants Bank's Motion, with prejudice, as to Plaintiff's first and federal claim for violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act. In his complaint, Plaintiff essentially pleads that he is disabled and he visited Defendant's bank branch, Defendant does not have a lowered teller station, and as a result, he was denied full and equal access. This is insufficient to state a claim for violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act. Under *Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports*, 631 F.3d 939 (9th Cir. 2011) Plaintiff is required to allege the necessary facts to support how the purported barriers related to Plaintiff's disability and denied him "full and equal" access to store, and to sufficiently allege an injury-in-fact, of the kind and nature required for Plaintiff to have standing. Plaintiff has failed to plead these necessary facts and the facts he has alleged in his complaint are insufficient.

Further, the Court declines to assert jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims, and those claims are therefore also dismissed, without prejudice, for reasons as stated above and on the record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 30, 2012

By:

THE HONORABLE MANUEL L. REAL JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT